

REMARKS

The indicated allowability of Claim 9 is acknowledged with appreciation.

Claims 1-6 have been cancelled.

Newly introduced Claims 11 and 12 are supported in original Claim 5; Claim 13 finds support in original Claim 6.

Claims 3-6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under section 112 said to be indefinite for their recited limitations in respect to an optional feature. The present amendments to Claims 9 and 10 are believed responsive.

As presently claimed the invention represented by Claim 7 is directed to a process of preparing a hollow chamber composite. The composite that includes a section having exterior and interior surfaces and a hollow interior, comprise at least one part and is fabricated from a specified material. It also includes a thermoplastic material molded onto at least a portion of its exterior surfaces. A key feature of the claimed process is the requirement recited as

“molding thermoplastic material onto at least a portion of the exterior surfaces of said section, and at least one part of said section (or at least a portion of said section) deforming plastically”,

Claims 1, 4, 7 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim (U.S. Patent 5,560,672) in view of Dingler (U.S. Patent 6,505,454).

Their cancellation renders moot the rejection of Claims 1 and 4. As discussed above the claimed process entails a process step whereby at least part of the claimed section is deformed plastically.

Lim disclosed an energy absorbing beam that entails a hollow chamber. Contrary to Examiner's argument, plastic deformation is not disclosed by Lim as a process step in the preparation of the composite.

Dingler disclosed a structural member and a process for its preparation. As plastic deformation is not disclosed as an essential feature of the referenced process, Dingler fails to augment Lim in any presently meaningful manner.

Falling short of the prima facie case, the rejection alleging unpatentability over Lim in view of Dingler is clearly untenable. Reconsideration in view of the above and withdrawal of the rejection are solicited.

Claims 2 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim in view of Dingler and further in view of Findlay (U.S. Patent 3,084,401).

Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claim 8 which depends on Claim 7 entails the required feature relative to plastic deformation.

Lim and Dingler have been discussed above and their shortcomings in the present context noted.

Findlay disclosed a suspension system for receiving and supporting ceiling panels. Nothing in Findlay is seen to in any way to add to the Lim and Dingler documents in a presently meaningful manner.

Reconsideration of the patentability of Claim 8 in view of the above and withdrawal of the rejection are solicited.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim and Dingler in view of Sekiyama (U.S. Patent 4,457,547).

The cancellation of Claims 5 and 6 renders moot their rejection of these documents.

Believing the above represent a complete response to the Office Action and that the application is in condition for allowance, Applicants request the earliest issuance of an indication to this effect.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Aron Preis
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 29,426

Bayer MaterialScience LLC
100 Bayer Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15205-9741
(412) 777-3814
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:
(412) 777-3902
s:\shared\jmf\AP8020.amd